

REMARKS

As requested a new oath in compliance with CFR 1.63(a) and CFR 1.76 is enclosed. Additionally a Information Disclosure Statement, not incorporated in the specification is enclosed. In view of the information disclosed in the Google search it is believed that the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn; however, if the Examiner is still not satisfied, there is no objection to substitute "rubber" therefore, as such is also disclosed in the specification. The rejection of Claims 4 and 5 have been obviated by making these Claims depend from allowed Claim 1. Attention is called to one word in line 3 under Detailed Description of the invention, "outlets" should be changed to inlets if it has not been changed already.

In view of the amendments to the specification and the Claims, it is believed this case is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are earnestly requested.

Respectfully,

James Hobart, Applicant

Robert Haiper

By Robert Haiper, Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 30,536

RM
RH/jh

Ph. 301-572-2089; fax 301-572-4719

02/23/2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY